

II. Remarks

Reconsideration and re-examination of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is herein respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned for an interview prior to the issuance of a subsequent office action.

Drawings and Specification

The drawings stand objected under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Office Action states that the limitation, “changes from an upper luminance value at the lower temperature threshold to a lower luminance value at the upper temperature threshold,” as recited in claim 42, must be shown in the drawings. Additionally, the specification stands objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for claim 42. Applicants respectfully disagree with both objections.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 113, an applicant is only required to “furnish a drawing where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter to be patented.” Emphasis added. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a drawing is not required in the instant case since the claimed subject matter can be clearly understood without a drawing. In this regard, Applicants submit that at least paragraph [0019] of the specification illustrates the feature at issue:

For example, the processor 12 may run at full luminance up to 20-30° C. The processor 12 may decrease the luminance of the emissive display 14 linearly from full luminance at about 25.° C. to 50% of full luminance at about 85° C., and at least between about 80° C-90° C.

Therefore, it can be readily seen that the luminance of the display changes from an upper luminance value (e.g., “full luminance”) at a lower temperature threshold (e.g., “25° C”) to a lower luminance value (e.g., “50% of full luminance”) at the upper temperature threshold (e.g., “85° C”), as recited in claim 42. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that a drawing is not necessary and the objection to the drawings and specification should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action states that the claimed subject is not described in the specification so as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-28, and 30-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. 2001-312249 to Masami (Masami) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0036633 A1 to Kasahara et al. (Kasahara).

Independent claims 1, 15, and 28 recite, in pertinent part, that a controller is configured to decrease the display luminance of a display as the temperature of the display increases through a first temperature range until the temperature reaches an upper temperature threshold. The Office Action states that Masami does not disclose the foregoing feature. Nonetheless, the Office Action states that “Kasahara teaches to

decrease the display luminance as the temperature of the display increases through a first temperature range until the temperature reaches an upper temperature threshold.”

Applicants respectfully disagree.

According to Kasahara, the luminance of a display is controlled by linearly decreasing the luminance as the estimated temperature increases. For instance, if the estimated temperature increases, a multiplication factor is applied to decrease the luminance by a certain percentage. Notably, however, Kasahara does not disclose an upper temperature threshold. In other words, the display luminance will continue to decrease so long as the estimated temperature continues to increase. As such, the luminance of the display will eventually be zero. See, e.g., FIG. 9. In contrast, the claimed invention requires an upper temperature threshold so that the display luminance will no longer decrease if the temperature reaches or exceeds the upper temperature threshold. Accordingly, the present invention ensures a certain amount of luminance regardless of how high the temperature may reach (unlike Kasahara). For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is requested.

Respectfully submitted by,

Dated: September 29, 2009

/Robert K. Fergan/
Robert K. Fergan
Reg. No.: 51,674
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
524 South Main Street, Suite 200
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2921
(734) 302-6000